arXiv:1603.05412v2 [math.OC] 9 Oct 2016

# Online semi-parametric learning for inverse dynamics modeling

Diego Romeres[†], Mattia Zorzi[†], Raffaello Camoriano[⋆‡◇] and Alessandro Chiuso[†]

***Abstract*— This paper presents a semi-parametric algorithm for online learning of a robot inverse dynamics model. It combines the strength of the parametric and non-parametric modeling. The former exploits the rigid body dynamics equation, while the latter exploits a suitable kernel function. We provide an extensive comparison with other methods from the literature using real data from the iCub humanoid robot. In doing so we also compare two different techniques, namely cross validation and marginal likelihood optimization, for estimating the hyperparameters of the kernel function.**

## I. Introduction

Inverse dynamics models are very useful in robotics because they can guarantee high accuracy and low gain control. Building an inverse dynamics model from first principles may be very demanding and, in most cases, out of reach and not suitable for online applications. For this reason, it is of interest to build an inverse dynamics model directly from data, possibly online to allow for real time updating of the model, which is required for adaptation to changing conditions.

Traditionally, the inverse dynamics is described by a parametric model given by the rigid body dynamics (RBD), [1]. Then, inverse dynamics learning can be recasted as a parametric estimation problem, [2], [3], [4]. The main advantage of this approach is that it provides a global relationship between the input (joint angles, velocities and accelerations) and the output (torques). However, the linear model does not capture nonlinearities in the data. To overcome this difficulty, it is possible to describe the inverse dynamics using non-parametric models; we do so by casting the estimation problem in the Gaussian regression framework, [5], [6], [7], or, equivalently, in the regularization framework, [8]. The latter are characterized by a suitable kernel function. However, the drawback of this approach is that a large amount of data is required to produce accurate predictions, as well as high computational load to actually compute the estimated model. This approach is not new and several contributions have recently appeared; for instance in [9], [10] the inverse dynamics has been modeled combining the strength of the parametric and of the non-parametric approach. In the latter case two alternatives are possible. The first one is to embed the rigid body dynamics as "mean" in the non-parametric part. The second one is to incorporate the rigid body dynamics in the kernel function.

An important aspect in inverse dynamics learning is the variation of the mechanical properties caused by changing of tasks. It is then necessary to update the model online. In this framework, it is important that the online algorithm is able to take advantage of the knowledge already acquired from previously available data, thus speeding up the learning process. This concept is often called transfer learning [11], [12]. Several online learning algorithms have been proposed in the literature. We mention the non-parametric algorithm selecting a sparse subset of training data points (i.e. dictionary), [13], and the semi-parametric algorithms based on the locally weighted projection approach, [14], and on the local Gaussian process regression approach, [15]. In [16] a non-parametric online algorithm has been proposed in which the complexity is kept constant approximating the kernel function using so called "random features", [17], [18]. Finally, in [19] a semi-parametric online algorithm, exploiting the above approximation, has been proposed. Here, the rigid body dynamics, preliminarly estimated via least squares, has been embedded as mean in the non-parametric part.

Another important aspect is the estimation of the hyperparameters of the kernel function. The latter can be estimated according to the maximum likelihood approach, [5], or according to the validation set approach, [20].
The first contribution of the paper is to frame various semi-parametric learning techniques proposed in the literature [9], [10], [19] under the same general model, and to provide an online algorithm for this model, exploiting the random features approximation.

The second contribution of this paper is to compare these online algorithms for estimating the inverse dynamics of right arm of the iCub humanoid robot, [21], [22]. In doing that, we also compare the two different approaches for estimating the hyperparameters.

The paper is outlined as follows. In Section II we introduce parametric, non-parametric and semi-parametric models. In Section III the online algorithm to update the model. Section IV deals with the hyperparameters estimation. In Section V we test the different online algorithms for estimating the inverse dynamics of the right arm of the iCub. Finally, in Section VI we draw the conclusions.

## II. Inverse Dynamics Learning

Starting from the laws of physics it would in principle be possible to write a (direct) dynamical model which, having

This work has been supported by the FIRB project "Learning meets time" (RBFR12M3AC) funded by MIUR.

[†] Dept. of Information Engineering, University of Padova, Via Gradenigo 6/b, 35131, Padova, Italy (e-mail: {romeresd,zorzimat,chiuso}@dei.unipd.it)

[⋆] iCub Facility, Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia, Via Morego 30, Genoa 16163, Italy (e-mail: raffaello.camoriano@iit.it)

[‡] LCSL, Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA.

[◇] DIBRIS, Università degli Studi di Genova, Via Dodecaneso, 35, Genoa 16145, Italy.

as inputs the torques acting on the robot's joints, outputs the (sampled) trajectory of the free coordinates (joint angles) $q_s$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. This is the so called "direct dynamics".

However, for the purpose of control design, it is of interest to know which are the torques that should be applied in order to obtain a certain trajectory $q_s$. This is the purpose of inverse dynamics modeling: *finding a model which, having joint trajectories as inputs, outputs the applied torques.*

In order to simplify the modeling exercise, we shall assume, as customary, that not only joint angles $q_s$ can be measured, but also velocities $\dot{q}_s$ and accelerations $\ddot{q}_s$. Of course this is a (crude) approximation, but we leave possible alternatives to future work. This assumption simplifies considerably the modeling exercise because, given $q_s, \dot{q}_s, \ddot{q}_s$, the inverse dynamics model is, in principle, linear (see (3)).

From now on we shall denote with $x_s = [q_s^\top \ \dot{q}_s^\top \ \ddot{q}_s^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $m = 3n$, the vector "input locations" obtained by stacking positions, velocities and accelerations of all the $n$ joints of the robot. Similarly, $y_s \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the torques applied to the $n$ joints of the robot at time $s$. The inverse dynamics models we consider in this paper will be of the form

$$\mathcal{M}: \quad y_s = h(x_s) + e_s \quad s \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{1}$$

where $h$ is a, possibly non-linear, function and $e_s$ is a zero mean white Gaussian noise with unknown variance $\sigma^2 I_n$.

The problem of learning the inverse dynamics is that of *estimating* the model $\mathcal{M}$ (i.e. the function $h$) starting from a finite set of measured data samples $\{y_s, x_s\}_{s=1}^N$. This model can then be used for robot motion control, see Figure 1.




Fig. 1: Schematic for robot motion control.

More precisely, it is exploited to determine the feedforward joint torques $y_s^d$ which should be applied to follow a desired trajectory $x_s^d$, while employing a feedback controller in order to stabilize the system. Clearly, the more accurate the inverse dynamics model $\mathcal{M}$ is, the more accurate the motion control is. In this paper we shall consider several approaches, depending upon how the function $h(\cdot)$ in (1) is modelled.

### A. Linear Parametric Model

The rigid body dynamics (RBD) of a robot is described by the equation

$$y_s = M(q_s)\ddot{q}_s + C(q_s, \dot{q}_s)\ddot{q}_s + G(q_s) \tag{2}$$

where $M(q_s)$ is the inertia matrix of the robot, $C(q_s, \dot{q}_s)$ the Coriolis and centripetal forces and $G(q_s)$ the gravity forces, [1]. The terms on the right hand side of (2) can be rewritten as $\psi^\top(x_s)\pi$ which is linear in the robot (base) inertial parameters $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and where $\psi(x_s) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ is the known RBD regressor which is a combination of kinematic parameters. In order to make the problem of determining $\pi$ from measured data $y_s$ well posed, we follow a Bayesian approach modeling $\pi$ as a zero mean Gaussian random vector with covariance matrix $\gamma^2 I_p$. Therefore, we consider $h(x) = \psi(x)^\top \pi$ in (1), so that

$$y_s = \psi^\top(x_s)\pi + e_s \tag{3}$$

where $e_s$ is a zero-mean Gaussian noise with covariance matrix $\sigma^2 I_n$ and it represents nonlinearities of the robot that are not modeled in the rigid body dynamics (e.g. actuator dynamics, friction, etc.).

### B. Nonparametric Model

The robot inverse dynamics is modeled postulating

$$y_s = g(x_s) + e_s \tag{4}$$

(i.e. $h(x) = g(x)$ in (1)) where $g(x_s)$ is a zero mean vector valued (taking values in $\mathbb{R}^n$) Gaussian random process indexed in $\mathbb{R}^m$, with covariance function

$$\mathbb{E}[g(x_t)g(x_s)^\top] = \rho^2 K(x_t, x_s) I_n. \tag{5}$$

The parameter $\rho^2$ plays the role of scaling factor and $K$ is a positive definite function, known also as (reproducing) kernel, due to the link between Gaussian process regression and inverse problems in Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces (RKHS) [23]. In robotics, a typical choice is the Gaussian kernel, [16], [9], [10],

$$K(x_t, x_s) = e^{-\frac{\|x_t - x_s\|^2}{2\tau^2}} \tag{6}$$

where $\tau^2$ is the kernel width[1] and it represents the metric to correlate the input locations $x_t$ and $x_s$. The minimum variance linear estimator of $g$ at time $t$ is given by the solution of the regularization problem

$$\hat{g}_t = \underset{g \in \mathcal{H}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{s=1}^{t} \|y_s - g(x_s)\|^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \tag{7}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) of deterministic functions from $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ associated with $KI_n$ and with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$, [24]. By the representer Theorem,

$$\hat{g}_t(x) = \rho^2 \sum_{s=1}^{t} a_s K(x_s, x) \tag{8}$$

where $a_s \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Substituting (8) in (7) we obtain a Tikhonov regularization problem. However, the number of parameters is depending on the number of data $t$, making it hard to obtain on-line (recursive) solutions. To overcome this limitation, the kernel $K$ can be approximated, e.g. using the so-called random features, [17]. This exploits the fact that a positive definite real kernel is the Fourier transform of a

[1]Therefore, to be precise the function $K$ as well as its approximation (11), depends on the parameter $\tau$ which will be estimated from data, see Section IV. For simplicity of exposition this dependence is not made explicit in the notation.

non-negative function, which can thus be interpreted as a probability density [17]. For the Gaussian kernel, that is:

$$K(x_t, x_s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} p(\omega) e^{i\frac{\omega^\top (x_t - x_s)}{\tau}} \mathrm{d}\omega \tag{9}$$

where

$$p(\omega) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^m} e^{-\frac{\|\omega\|^2}{2}}. \tag{10}$$

Accordingly, we can approximate $K(x_t, x_s)$ with the sample mean of $e^{i\frac{\omega_k^\top (x_t - x_s)}{\tau}}$, $k = 1, .., d$ provided $w_k \sim p(\omega)$, that is:

$$K(x_t, x_s) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^{d} e^{i\frac{\omega_k^\top (x_t - x_s)}{\tau}} = \phi(x_t)^\top \phi(x_s) \tag{11}$$

where the basis functions $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ are

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \cos\left(\frac{\omega_1^\top x}{\tau}\right) & \dots & \cos\left(\frac{\omega_d^\top x}{\tau}\right) \\ \sin\left(\frac{\omega_1^\top x}{\tau}\right) & \dots & \sin\left(\frac{\omega_d^\top x}{\tau}\right) \end{array} \right]^\top. \tag{12}$$

This is equivalent to model $g(x)$ in the form

$$g(x) = (\phi(x)^\top \otimes I_n)\alpha \tag{13}$$

where $\alpha$ is a zero mean Gaussian vector with variance $\rho^2 I_{2dn}$. Therefore, the nonparametric model of the robot inverse dynamics (4) can be approximated by

$$y_s = (\phi(x_s)^\top \otimes I_n)\alpha + e_s. \tag{14}$$

We underline that a peculiarity of model (14) is that the regressor $\phi(x)$ is depending on the parameter to identify $\tau$. The advantage of reformulation (14) is that the dimension of the parameters to estimate $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{2dn}$ is fixed, which allows a recursive identification formulation, and arbitrary dimensionality: the number of basis functions $d$ can be chosen according to a trade-off between model and computational complexity.

### C. Semi-parametric model with RBD mean

This approach combines the parametric and nonparametric models, embedding in the nonparametric model a mean term, derived from the linear parametric model (3), of the form

$$m_s := \psi^\top(x_s)\pi \tag{15}$$

where $\pi$ is the vector of inertial parameters and $\psi(x_s)$ is the RBD regressor. Therefore, the inverse dynamics will be modeled as in (4) with $g(x_s)$ a Gaussian process such that

$$\begin{array}{rl} \mathbb{E}[g(x_s)] & = m_s = \psi^\top(x_s)\pi \\ \mathrm{Cov}\left(g(x_t), g(x_s)\right) & = \rho^2 K(x_t, x_s) I_n \end{array} \tag{16}$$

where $K$ is the Gaussian Kernel defined in (6). Approximating, as above, the kernel $K$ in (16) with the random features (11), the semi-parametric model of the inverse dynamics takes the form

$$y_s = \psi^\top(x_s)\pi + (\phi^\top(x_s) \otimes I_n)\alpha + e_s \tag{17}$$

where $\alpha$ is a random vector with zero mean and covariance matrix $\rho^2 I_{2dn}$. As before, $e_s$ is white noise with covariance matrix $\sigma^2 I_n$.

At this point two alternatives are possible. The first and most principled one is to treat $\pi$ as an unknown parameter, which is to be estimated along with $\rho$, $\sigma$ and $\tau$ using e.g. the marginal likelihood as described in Section IV. A suboptimal alternative is to assume $\pi$ to be known, possibly estimated using some preliminary experiment as in [9]. In this latter case it will be denoted by $\hat{\pi}$, and therefore we are only left with modeling the residual vector

$$\tilde{y}_s := y_s - \psi^\top(x_s)\hat{\pi} = (\phi^\top(x_s) \otimes I_n)\alpha + e_s. \tag{18}$$

This latter strategy is followed, for instance, in [19], where the vector $\hat{\pi}$ is obtained solving in the least squares sense the regression model (3).

### D. Semi-parametric model with RBD kernel

An alternative possibility for combining the parametric and nonparametric models in model (4), is to incorporate the RBD structure in the kernel, [9]. Therefore, $g(x_s)$ is a random process with zero mean and covariance function

$$\mathbb{E}[g(x_t)g(x_s)^\top] = \gamma^2 \psi(x_t)^\top \psi(x_s) + \rho^2 K(x_t, x_s) I_n \tag{19}$$

where the first term $\psi(x_s)$ is the RBD regressor and the second term, $K$, is the Gaussian Kernel defined in (6). As before, $e_s$ is white noise with covariance matrix $\sigma^2 I_n$. Using the kernel approximation (11), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[g(x_t)g(x_s)^\top] = \gamma^2 \psi(x_t)^\top \psi(x_s) + \rho^2 \phi(x_t)^\top \phi(x_s) I_n. \tag{20}$$

Accordingly, the approximated semi-parametric model of the inverse dynamics with RBD kernel is:

$$y_s = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \psi^\top(x_s) & \phi^\top(x_s) \otimes I_n \end{array} \right] \theta + e_s \tag{21}$$

where $\theta = [\pi^\top \quad \alpha^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p+2dn}$ is a zero mean Gaussian random vector with covariance matrix $\mathrm{blkdiag}(\gamma^2 I_p, \rho^2 I_{2dn})$.

The semiparametric model with RBD kernel described in this Section is connected, under the Bayesian framework, with the RBD mean model in Section (II-C). In fact, model (17) is equivalent to model (21) when $\gamma \to \infty$ and the parameters $(\rho, \sigma, \tau)$ are fixed; for reasons of space this result will not be explained here.

## III. Online Learning

It is apparent that, using the random features approximation of the Gaussian kernel (11), all model classes described in the previous Section, see equations (3), (14), (17) and (21), can ultimately be written in the form :

$$\mathcal{M}: \quad y_s = \varphi(x_s)^\top \theta + e_s, \quad s = 1 \dots t \tag{22}$$

for a suitable choice of the regressor vector $\varphi(x_s)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is modeled as a zero mean random vector with a suitable covariance matrix $\Sigma_0$. $e_s$ is white noise with covariance matrix $\sigma^2 I_n$. In this Section we shall assume that $\Sigma_0$, $\tau$ and $\sigma^2$ are known, how to estimate them is a crucial

point and will be explained in Section IV. Thus, the vector $\theta$ completely specifies the inverse dynamics model and, as such, our learning problem has been reduced to estimating the vector $\theta$ in (22). At time $t$, the minimum variance linear estimator (i.e. Bayes estimator) of $\theta$ is given by the solution of the Tikhonov regularization problem:

$$\hat{\theta}_t = \underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{s=1}^{t} \|y_s - \varphi(x_s)^\top \theta\|^2 + \|\theta\|^2_{\Sigma_0^{-1}}. \quad (23)$$

This coincides with the so called Regularized Least Squares problem and its optimal solution can be computed recursively through the well known Recursive Least Squares algorithm, see e.g [25, Chapter 11]. In practice, the implementation of this algorithm uses Cholesky-based updates [26], which have robust numerical properties.

## IV. Hyperparameters estimation

All the models presented in Section II depend on one or more parameter, called hyperparameters, which describe the prior model. For instance, the hyperparameters in model (17), used in semi-parametric learning with RBD mean, are $\xi := (\pi, \rho^2, \tau^2, \sigma^2)$ while those in model (21), used in semi-parametric learning with RBD kernel, are $\xi := (\gamma^2, \rho^2, \tau^2, \sigma^2)$. These hyperparameters are not known and need to be estimated from the data. In what follows, we consider two different approaches to address this problem.

### A. Validation set approach

The batch of data used for the identification is split in two data sets: the training set and the validation set. We define a set of candidate hyperparameters and we denote it as $\Xi$. For each $\xi \in \Xi$ we estimate the inverse dynamics model $\mathcal{M}_\xi$ using the training set. Then, for any $\mathcal{M}_\xi$ the mean squared error $\mathrm{MSE}(\xi)$ is computed using the validation set. Hence, the latter provides an estimate of the error rate. According to the validation set approach, [20, Chapter 6], the optimal hyperparameters are given by solving

$$\hat{\xi} = \underset{\xi \in \Xi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ \mathrm{MSE}(\xi). \quad (24)$$

In practice this approach is limited to estimation of a small number of hyperparameters since minimization (24) is typically performed by gridding the search space $\Xi$.

### B. Maximum likelihood approach

Consider, without loss of generality, model (22) where both $\theta$ and $e_s$ are assumed to be Gaussian and uncorrelated. Accordingly, the negative marginal loglikelihood (or evidence) of $\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1^\top & \dots & y_t^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ given $\xi \in \Xi$ takes the form

$$L_\xi(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2} \log\det V + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{y} + c \quad (25)$$

where

$$V = \Phi \Sigma_0 \Phi^T + \sigma^2 I_{tn}, \quad \Phi^\top = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(x_1) & \dots & \varphi(x_t) \end{bmatrix}$$

and $c$ is a term not depending on $\xi$. According to the maximum likelihood approach, [5, Chapter 5], the optimal hyperparameters are given by solving

$$\hat{\xi} = \underset{\xi \in \Xi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ L_\xi(\mathbf{y}). \quad (26)$$

## V. Inverse Dynamics Learning on iCub

iCub is a full-body humanoid robot with 53 degrees of freedom, [21]. We aim to test the models of Section II for learning online the inverse dynamics of its right arm. We consider as inputs $x_s$ the angular positions, velocities and accelerations of the 3 degrees of freedom (dof) shoulder joints and of the 1-dof elbow joint. The outputs $y_s$ are the 3 force and 3 torque components measured by the six-axes force/torque (F/T) sensor embedded in the shoulder of the iCub arm, see Figure 2.




Fig. 2: iCub's right arm.

Notice that the measured forces/torques are not the applied joint forces and torques and, as such, the model we learn is not, strictly speaking, the inverse dynamics model. Yet, as explained in [27], the feedforward joint torques can be determined from components (forces and torques) of $y_s$. Indeed, such model has been used in the literature as a benchmark for the inverse dynamics learning, [16], [19] .

We consider the 2 datasets used in [19], corresponding to different trajectories of the end-effector. In the first one the end-effector tracks circles in the XY plane of radius $10cm$ at an approximative speed of $6m/s$; in the second one, the end-effector tracks similar circles but in the XZ plane (the Z axis corresponds to the vertical direction, parallel to the gravity force). The two circles are tracked using the Cartesian controller proposed in [28]. Each dataset contains approximately 8 minutes of data collected at a sampling rate of $20Hz$, for a total of 10000 points per dataset. One single circle is completed by the robot in about 1.25 seconds which corresponds to 25 points.

We shall consider the models described in Section II, endowed with the marginal likelihood approach (ML) for the estimation of the hyperparameters, as well as the validation based methods[2] discussed in [19]. For ease of exposition we will use the following shorthands:

[2]As discussed in Section IV, using validation based methods is unfeasible when the number of hyperparameters is large; therefore we have not applied validation to the semi-parametric model with RBD mean when the mean is to be considered as an hyperparameter nor to the semi-parametric model with RBD kernel which has the extra parameter $\gamma$.

- *P*: the parametric model.
- *NP-ML*: the nonparametric model; hyperparameters estimated with ML.
- *SP-ML*: the semi-parametric model with RBD mean; hyperparameters estimated with ML.
- *SP2-ML*: the semi-parametric model with RBD mean, in which the mean is computed via least squares as in [19] and then the nonparametric model is applied to the residuals (see Section (II-C)); hyperparameters estimated with ML.
- *SPK-ML*: the semi-parametric model with RBD kernel; hyperparameters estimated with ML.
- *NP-VS*: the nonparametric model with hyperparameters estimated with VS.
- *SP2-VS*: the semi-parametric model with RBD mean, in which the mean is computed via least squares; hyperparameters estimated with VS.

The proposed algorithms have been implemented using Matlab. The RBD regressor $\psi$ for the right arm of iCub has been computed using the library iDynTree, [29]. The Marginal Likelihood has been optimized using the Matlab `fminsearch.m` function. The recursive least square algorithms have been implemented using GURLS library, [30]. The results of all validation based methods are obtained using code which has been kindly provided by the authors of [19].

For each algorithm as above, we consider the following online learning scenario (with reference to the general model structure (22)):

- Initialization: The first 1000 points in XY-dataset are used to estimate the hyperparameters, as well as to compute an initial estimate of parameter $\theta$, say $\hat{\theta}_0$.
- Training XY: Use the remaining 9000 points of XY-dataset to update online parameter $\theta$ using the recursive least-squares algorithm, thus obtaining $\hat{\theta}_t$, $t = 1, \ldots, 9000$.
- Training XZ: The XZ-dataset is split in 5 sequential subsets of 2000 points (approximately 100 seconds) each. For each subset we update online the parameter $\theta$ independently always initializing the recursions with $\hat{\theta}_{9000}$, computed from the training dataset XY .

In the last step of the procedure, the initial model has been computed from the Training XY dataset, which corresponds to a different motion with respect to XZ-dataset. Our goal is that the model estimated with the second dataset quickly captures the new information gathered from the XZ-dataset, adapting to the new task. For instance, in model predictive control the quality of the control depends on the prediction capability of the model over a prescribed horizon, [31]. In order to measure this ability we consider the following index:

$$\varepsilon_t^{(k)} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{T} (y_{t+s}^{(k)} - \hat{y}_{t+s|t}^{(k)})^2}{\sum_{s=1}^{T} (y_{t+s}^{(k)})^2} \tag{27}$$

where $\hat{y}_{t+s|t}^{(k)}$ is the estimate of the output $y_{t+s}^{(k)}$ at time $t+s$ using the *model* estimated with data up to time $t$. Therefore, $\varepsilon_t^{(k)}$ represents the relative squared prediction error over the horizon $[t+1, \ldots, t+T]$ using model $\mathcal{M}$ computed at time $t$. Let $\varepsilon_t^F$ and $\varepsilon_t^T$ be the average value of $\varepsilon_t^{(k)}$ for the 3 forces and the 3 torques, respectively.




Fig. 3: Average (over the 5 subsets of 100 seconds each) of the relative squared prediction errors $\varepsilon_t^F$ and $\varepsilon_t^T$, computed with $T = 25$ corresponding to an horizon of 1.25 seconds.

In Figure 3 we show $\varepsilon_t^F$ and $\varepsilon_t^T$, averaged over the 5 subsets, with $T = 25$ (1.25 seconds), i.e. with the end-effector completing one circle during the prediction horizon. Clearly, the parametric algorithm P exhibits a poor performance because it describes only crude idealizations of the actual dynamics. The algorithms based on the VS approach perform significantly worse in the first 60 seconds than those based on the ML approach. This result is not unexpected because the ML approach represents a robust way to estimate hyperparamters, [32]. The models with the best performance are SP-ML and SPK-ML because they combine the benefit of the parametric and the non-parametric approach. Although also SP2-ML exploits this benefit, it provides a slightly worse performance. This is probably due by the fact that the first (least squares) step, i.e. estimation of the linear model, is subject to a strong bias deriving from the unmodeled dynamics. Instead, a sound approach is followed by SP-ML and SPK-ML in which the estimation of the hyperparameters is performed jointly, avoiding such bias. In the steady state all these methods, with the exception of P, provide similar performance; yet the two semi-parametric models (SP-ML and SPK-ML) perform better both in terms of average as well as standard deviation, as clearly shown in Figure 4 which reports the boxplots of $\varepsilon_t^F$ and $\varepsilon_t^T$ in "steady state", i.e. after the first 30 seconds which is considered to be transient (see Figure 3).

## VI. Conclusions

In this paper we have placed several algorithms used for online learning of the robot inverse dynamics in a common framework. Such algorithms are classified according




Fig. 4: Boxplots of the steady state (i.e. after 30 seconds, see Figure 3) relative squared prediction errors $\varepsilon_t^F$ and $\varepsilon_t^T$, computed with $T = 25$ corresponding to an horizon of 1.25 seconds.

to the considered model (parametric, non-parametric, semi-parametric with RBD mean and semi-parametric with RBD kernel) and according to the way the hyperparameters are estimated (VS approach and ML approach). We applied those algorithms for online leaning of the inverse dynamics of the right arm of the iCub. The results showed the superiority of the ML approach to estimate the hyperparameters. Finally, semi-parametric models outperform the others. The latter result confirms the advantage in combining parametric and non-parametric approaches together.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the iCub Facility and LCSL-IIT@MIT research groups led by Francesco Nori and Lorenzo Rosasco for making their data and code available to us.

## REFERENCES

[1] B. Siciliano, L. Sciavicco, L. Villani, and G. Oriolo, *Robotics: modelling, planning and control*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.

[2] J. Hollerbach, W. Khalil, and M. Gautier, "Model identification," in *Springer Handbook of Robotics*. Springer, 2008, pp. 321–344.

[3] M. Zorzi, "Rational approximations of spectral densities based on the alpha divergence," *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 259–278, 2014.

[4] ——, "Multivariate Spectral Estimation based on the concept of Optimal Prediction," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 60, pp. 1647–1652, Jun. 2015.

[5] C. Rasmussen and C. Williams, *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. The MIT Press, 2006.

[6] M. Zorzi and A. Chiuso, "A Bayesian approach to sparse plus low rank network identification," in *54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Dec 2015, pp. 7386–7391.

[7] ——, "Sparse plus Low rank Network Identification: A Nonparametric Approach," *Automatica*, vol. 53, 2017.

[8] R. Rifkin, G. Yeo, and T. Poggio, "Regularized least-squares classification," *Nato Science Series Sub Series III Computer and Systems Sciences*, vol. 190, pp. 131–154, 2003.

[9] D. Nguyen-Tuong and J. Peters, "Using model knowledge for learning inverse dynamics," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2010.

[10] T. Wu and J. Movellan, "Semi-parametric gaussian process for robot system identification," in *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2012, pp. 725–731.

[11] S. J. Pan and Q. Yang, "A survey on transfer learning," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 1345–1359, 2010.

[12] B. Bocsi, L. Csató, and J. Peters, "Alignment-based transfer learning for robot models," in *The 2013 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 2013, pp. 1–7.

[13] D. Nguyen-Tuong and J. Peters, "Incremental online sparsification for model learning in real-time robot control," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 74, no. 11, pp. 1859–1867, 2011.

[14] J. S. de la Cruz, D. Kulic, W. S. Owen, E. Calisgan, and E. A. Croft, "On-line dynamic model learning for manipulator control." in *SyRoCo*, 2012, pp. 869–874.

[15] D. Nguyen-Tuong, M. Seeger, and J. Peters, "Model learning with local gaussian process regression," *Advanced Robotics*, vol. 23, no. 15, pp. 2015–2034, 2009.

[16] A. Gijsberts and G. Metta, "Incremental learning of robot dynamics using random features," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2011, pp. 951–956.

[17] A. Rahimi and B. Recht, "Random features for large-scale kernel machines," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2007, pp. 1177–1184.

[18] J. Quinonero-Candela and C. E. Rasmussen, "A unifying view of sparse approximate gaussian process regression," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 6, pp. 1939–1959, 2005.

[19] R. Camoriano, S. Traversaro, L. Rosasco, G. Metta, and F. Nori, "Incremental semiparametric inverse dynamics learning," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, May 2016, pp. 544–550.

[20] G. James, D. Witten, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, *An introduction to statistical learning*. Springer, 2013, vol. 112.

[21] G. Metta, L. Natale, F. Nori, G. Sandini, D. Vernon, L. Fadiga, C. Von Hofsten, K. Rosander, M. Lopes, J. Santos-Victor *et al.*, "The icub humanoid robot: An open-systems platform for research in cognitive development," *Neural Networks*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 1125–1134, 2010.

[22] S. Traversaro, A. Del Prete, R. Muradore, L. Natale, and F. Nori, "Inertial parameter identification including friction and motor dynamics," in *13th IEEE-RAS International Conference on Humanoid Robots (Humanoids)*, 2013, pp. 68–73.

[23] G. Wahba, *Spline models for observational data*. Siam, 1990, vol. 59.

[24] N. Aronszajn, "Theory of reproducing kernels," *Trans. of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 68, pp. 337–404, 1950.

[25] L. Ljung, *System Identification, Theory for the User*. Prentice Hall, 1997.

[26] A. Björck, *Numerical Methods for Least Squares Problems*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1996. [Online]. Available: http://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611971484

[27] S. Ivaldi, M. Fumagalli, M. Randazzo, F. Nori, G. Metta, and G. Sandini, "Computing robot internal/external wrenches by means of inertial, tactile and f/t sensors: theory and implementation on the icub," in *Humanoid Robots (Humanoids), 2011 11th IEEE-RAS International Conference on*, 2011, pp. 521–528.

[28] U. Pattacini, F. Nori, L. Natale, G. Metta, and G. Sandini, "An experimental evaluation of a novel minimum-jerk cartesian controller for humanoid robots," *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 1668–1674, 2010.

[29] F. Nori, S. Traversaro, J. Eljaik, F. Romano, A. Del Prete, and D. Pucci, "icub whole-body control through force regulation on rigid non-coplanar contacts," *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, p. 18, 2015.

[30] A. Tacchetti, P. Mallapragada, M. Santoro, and R. Rosasco, "Gurls: A least squares library for supervised learning," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 14, pp. 3201–3205, 2013.

[31] J. M. Maciejowski, *Predictive control: with constraints*. Pearson education, 2002.

[32] G. Pillonetto and A. Chiuso, "Tuning complexity in regularized kernel-based regression and linear system identification: The robustness of the marginal likelihood estimator," *Automatica*, vol. 58, pp. 106 – 117, 2015.